

Section 00120

Evaluation Factors For Award

1. SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD (SSEB) –

1.1. A Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will be established to conduct the evaluation of proposals received in response to this solicitation. The evaluation will be based on the content of the proposal and any subsequent discussions required, as well as information obtained from other sources, e.g. past performance information. The SSEB will not consider any information or data incorporated by reference or otherwise referred to. The identities of the SSEB personnel are confidential, and any attempt by the offerors to contact these individuals is prohibited.

1.2. The SSEB will evaluate the proposals submitted and assign a consensus rating for each proposal. Cost information will then be considered on a subjective basis and an overall ranking for each proposal will be established.

2. SOURCE SELECTION

All offers received in response to this solicitation will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of Sections "00110", "00120", and the Source Selection Plan. The principal objective of the evaluation process is to make award of one (1) contract to the responsible offeror whose proposal is determined to be the "best value" to the Government, price and other factors considered on a full and open competition basis. Should the Government determine that the award of a contract is not in the best interest of the Government, the contract award will not take place. A competitive range determination, if necessary, will be determined from the information submitted in the proposals. Identified weaknesses will form the basis for discussions, if necessary. The rating results of the evaluation along with the subjective evaluation of the pricing in a "trade-off" evaluation process will form the basis for source selection.

3. Source Selection Process -

3.1. SSEB Evaluation - The SSEB will evaluate all conforming proposals received. Notations of weak or unacceptable areas as well as any defects or strong features contained within the proposal will be utilized for development of subjects for discussion and debriefings shall be annotated in the comment sections of the Proposal Evaluation Worksheet. If during evaluation of those proposals by the SSEB, an offer is determined to have a critical defect, that defect will be brought to the immediate attention of the Chairperson. The Chairperson, in conjunction with advice from Office of Counsel and Contracting, will confirm the presence of the critical defect. Any proposal being evaluated, determined to have a critical defect will not be evaluated further. The offer having the critical defect will be forwarded to the SSA and Contracting Officer for review and a determination of elimination from further evaluation and consideration as appropriate.

If determined by the SSA and the Contracting Officer, with the advice of Office of Counsel and contracting advisors, that the offer has a critical defect, the offer will be rejected and the offeror notified of their proposal having a critical defect as soon as practicable. That offeror will then be eliminated from the selection process. ***A "Critical Defect" is defined as a defect that cannot be remedied without a revision or rewrite of the proposal.***

The SSEB will rate each proposal, evaluating each item in the solicitation. All information requested will be evaluated unless the offeror exceeds the page limit parameters. Ratings of the offers will then be discussed among the SSEB voting members, a consensus reached and recorded. Cost will be

subjectively evaluated using “trade-off” techniques. The subjective evaluation will consist of cost analysis performed for the purpose of determining the reasonableness, realism of the price information, and affordability to assist the Government in determining if the offeror has a clear understanding of the work requirements.

3.2. SSO Evaluation - The Source Selection Official will take the information provided for each offeror, review the SSEB process and ratings and in conjunction with the Contracting Officer, make a determination of Competitive Range if determined to be necessary. A “Competitive Range” is a subjective determination of that range of ratings and cost information which has the best potential for being selected for award and offers best value to the Government. The SSEB will attempt to include in the Competitive Range only those offeror’s that have the best chance of being considered for award.

4. Evaluation Criteria -

As established in Sections 00110 and 00120 of the solicitation, the following criteria will form the basis of proposal evaluation. The Technical criterion (Volume I) are listed in descending order of importance below. The Cost/Price portion of the proposal will be evaluated separately in accordance with Paragraph 4.3.

VOLUME I – EVALUATION CRITERIA
<u>Volume I, Section I: Mobilization/Strategic Management Plans</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tab 1/Deployment Plan – mobilizing to meet the mission• Tab 2/Organizational Structure of Proposed Team• Tab 3/Corporate Safety Programs• Tab 4/Quality Assurance/Quality Control Programs
<u>Volume I, Section II: Experience, Personnel and Specialized Expertise</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tab 1/Resumes of Key Personnel for this proposed contract• Tab 2/Expertise in disaster response• Tab 3/Expertise in roofing or roofing missions
<u>Volume I, Section III: Capacity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tab 1/Resources and ability to respond to a disaster of varying magnitudes and execute an aggressive ramp-up/completion schedule

Volume I, Section IV: Past Performance

- Tab 1/Managerial Effectiveness in Disaster Response/Corporate Business Practices
- Tab 2/Timely Performance

Volume I, Section V: SUBCONTRACTING

- Tab 1/Subcontracting with local entities

FOR LARGE BUSINESS OFFERORS ONLY:

- Tab 2/Subcontracting Plan including Proposed Subcontracting Opportunities for designated socio-economic groups
- **Tab 3/Subcontracting Plan past performance**

Note: The Maximum Number of Pages for Section IV:

- **Large Business – 25 Pages (Tabs 1 & 2 Combined shall use no more than 10 Pages and Tab 3 shall use no more than 15 Pages.)**

Small Business – 2 Pages (Small Business is required to submit only Tab 1 for this section)

NOTE: The Offeror/Large Business shall not utilize unused pages from this section to supplement other technical sections. If they choose to submit excess pages, the excess pages will not be evaluated by the SSEB.

VOLUME II – EVALUATION CRITERIA**Volume II, Section I: Contractor Information & Certifications**

- Tab 1/SF 1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award
- Tab 2/Representations and Certifications (Section 00600)

Volume II, Section II: Pricing Schedule

- Tab 1/Supplies or Services and Prices/Costs (Section 00010)

4.1. Technical merit shall be evaluated for each major factor and sub factor contained in Volume I, except for the Past Performance evaluations as found in Volume I, Section IV and Volume I, Section V, Tab 3, Subcontracting Plan Past Performance. Technical merit, which reflect the Government's confidence in each offeror's ability, as demonstrated in its proposal, to perform the requirements stated in the RFP, shall be evaluated based on the following:

(i) Outstanding: Proposal demonstrates an excellent understanding of requirements and offeror's proposal shows that they have significantly exceeded performance or capability standards. Proposal has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. Proposal represents very low risk that the offeror's performance of any work requirements will impact schedule, cost, or performance.

(ii) Above Average: Proposal demonstrates a good understanding of requirements and offeror's proposal shows that they have exceeded performance or capability standards. Proposal has two or more strengths that will benefit the Government. Proposal represents low risk that the offeror's performance of any work requirements will impact schedule, cost, or performance.

(iii) Satisfactory: Proposal demonstrates acceptable understanding of the requirements and offeror's proposal meets performance or capability standards. Proposal demonstrates one strength that will benefit the Government. Proposal represents moderate risk that the offeror's performance of any work requirements will impact schedule, cost, or performance.

(iv) Marginal: Proposal demonstrates shallow understanding of requirements and offeror's proposal only marginally meets performance or capability standards for minimal but acceptable contract performance. Proposal has no strengths that will benefit the Government and may have weaknesses that are detrimental to the Government. Proposal represents high risk that the offeror's performance of any work requirements will impact schedule, cost, or performance.

(v) Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the proposal. Proposal represents very high risk that the offeror's performance of any work requirements will impact schedule, cost, or performance.

4.2. Past Performance Risk Ratings shall be done for each major factor and sub factor contained in Past Performance Volume I, Section IV and Volume I, Section V, Tab 3, Subcontracting Plan Past Performance. Past Performance Risk Ratings assess the risks associated with each offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the RFP based on the offeror's demonstrated performance on recent contracts. Offerors that have no relevant performance record will be given a neutral rating for these factors. The rating criteria are as follows:

(i) Very Low Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides essentially no doubt that the offeror will successfully perform any required effort.

(ii) Low Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides little doubt that the offeror will successfully perform any required effort.

(iii) Moderate Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides some doubt that the offeror will successfully perform any required effort.

(iv) High Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides substantial doubt that the offeror will successfully perform any required effort.

(v) Very High Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides extreme doubt that the offeror will successfully perform any required effort.

(vi) Unknown Risk: The offeror has no relevant performance record. A thorough search was unable to identify any past performance information.

4.3. The cost/price portion of the proposal for evaluation will be subjectively evaluated allowing for a "best value" analysis of the proposal as a whole using a trade-off process. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

4.4. Overall, evaluators shall assess the proposal's acceptability to the requirements of the RFP. If a technical factor/sub factor is not addressed, it shall be rated as unsatisfactory. If a past performance factor/sub factor is not addressed, it shall be rated as unknown risk. Should the proposal contain a critical defect, the proposal shall be handled as accordance with Paragraph 3.

4.5. All members will be required to evaluate all proposals. The findings of any individual so appointed will be presented to the entire SSEB. Individual evaluations will then be discussed among the voting membership of the SSEB in order to reach consensus. The proposals will then be ranked in order from highest to lowest based on evaluations and weight for each factor. An average rating shall not be used.

4.6. Voting members shall also make notations supporting excellent, good, satisfactory, marginal, or unsatisfactory ratings for factors and sub factors of the proposals and notations supporting past performance risk ratings. The comments shall be used for substantiation of their consensus evaluation, the development of subjects for clarifications, communications, exchanges, and discussions

with offerors determined to be in competitive range, and in the debriefing of unsuccessful offerors, if required. The SSEB may attach additional comment sheets to the evaluation sheets, if necessary.

4.7. SSEB members shall note that FAR 15.305 requires that an agency evaluate competitive proposals solely on the factors specified in the solicitation. SSEB members shall not speculate about an offeror's intent, but shall base their evaluation on the information supplied and clarification received, if required.

5. Sub Factor Evaluation Criteria

The Government will evaluate the information submitted in accordance with Section 00120 of the RFP and the Source Selection Plan. The Government will use the criteria evaluation system established in Section 00110 of the Source Selection Plan.

5.1.1 Volume I, Section I, Tab 1 – Mobilization Plan

The Government will evaluate this portion of the proposal based on the requirements set forth as specified in Section 00110. The Government places a higher value on an established mobilization plan, to include considerations for rapid deployment such as work permits, immunizations, and mobility agreements by key employees. The Government places a higher value on established compensation plans for extended deployment periods. The Government places a higher value on consideration of an established rotational assignment system and well-planned transition when a rotation is deemed necessary. The Government places a higher value on experience and consideration given to making travel arrangements in other than optimal travel situations, long-term employee deployment compensation/reimbursement policies such as corporate travel cards or interim travel vouchers, staffing plans, key personnel availability, backup plans, and deployment preparedness.

Established invoice tracking mechanisms, and processes for accurate estimating procedures would be considered highly valued. Consideration for staffing and oversight to reach ramp-up schedules for each size of event is encouraged. The Government places a higher value on existing plans that provide continuity and efficiency in the field, yet account for optimal safety conscious work environments.

5.1.3 Volume I, Section I, Tab 2 - Organizational Structure of the Proposed Team

The Government places a higher value on an organizational structure, which has demonstrated efficiency in day-to-day operations by exceeding contract milestone schedules, quicker resolution of problems, clear roles and responsibilities, excellent communication networks, and identifies how safety throughout the organization will be addressed. The Government places a higher value on successful organizational relationships, which have been used on other projects. The Government places a higher value on successful organizational structures, which demonstrate tangible benefits resulting in greater customer satisfaction. The Government places a higher value on proposals that provide a description of the relationship/contractual agreements with the proposed subcontractors.

5.1.4 Volume I, Section I, Tab 3 – Safety Program

The Government places a higher value on innovative practices or programs, which demonstrate a reduction in Health and Safety accidents. The Government places a higher value on no accidents or near misses within the last three years.

5.1.5 Volume I, Section I, Tab 4 -- Program & Corporate Business Practices

The Government will evaluate this portion of the proposal based on the requirements set forth as specified in Section 00110. The Government places a higher value on construction and operational demonstrated approaches that resulted in demonstrated increases in the quality of the outputs. The Government places a higher value on a QA/QC Program, which demonstrates data quality assurance measures are in place.

5.2 Volume I, Section II – Experience, Personnel, and Specialized Expertise

5.2.1 Volume I, Section I, Tab 1 - Resumes of Key Personnel for This Contract

The Government will evaluate this portion of the proposal based on the requirements set forth as specified in Section 00110. In addition, the Government places a higher value on key personnel that have a diversity of project experience, education, and qualifications. The Government places a higher value on personnel that have experience working on Government projects. The Government places the highest value on those personnel that are familiar with the geographic locality, political structures, influences and cultural traditions.

5.2.2 Volume I, Section I, Tabs 2 & 3 – Summary of Previous Experience – Disaster Response and Roofing

The contractor's previous experience will be examined for breadth and depth. The Government places value on demonstrated field activities experience, construction, overall planning, management and organizational capabilities during quick response, high stress, or disaster related situations. The Government places a higher value on projects that employed massive quantities of roofing repairs. The Government places a higher value on projects that implemented efficiency processes to cut response, deployment, or performance time and costs for the customer. The Government places a higher value on a demonstrated ability to execute federal work and projects in which the firm served as the prime contractor. The Government places a higher value on larger projects and projects that involve multiple sites, often remote. The Government places a higher value on more complex, yet successful projects. The Government places a higher value on projects, which included a favorable partnering with stakeholders to achieve uncommon results. Finally, the Government places a higher value on projects, which were completed on time, within budget, and meets the project objectives.

5.3 Volume I, Section III – Capacity

The Government will consider the fiscal, organizational, managerial, and physical capacity of the firm to manage disasters of varying magnitudes in conjunction with normal business operations and ongoing commitments. Preference is given to firms with a diverse business base and a history of effective growth planning.

5.4 Volume I, Section IV - Past Performance

5.4.1. Volume I, Section IV, Tabs 1 and 2 - Past Performance Project Narrative With Points of Contact

The Government will focus on areas covered in the requirements of this proposal including records of conforming to contract specifications, standards of workmanship, adherence

to contract schedules, history of reasonable and cooperative behavior with regulators and other stakeholders, and commitment to customer satisfaction. The Government also places a higher value on projects, which document successful outcomes and are supported by outside source confirmation (e.g. Past Performance Reports documenting an excellent performance rating by the contractor on a specific project or telephone interviews with POCs identified in the proposal). The Government also places a higher value on projects, which provided particular difficulty or unique challenges and the innovative methods the contractor used to resolve problems successfully. If the Government does not receive past performance information for the project(s) identified by the offeror and cannot establish a past performance record for the offeror through other sources, or the offeror has no past performance record, the offeror will be given a neutral rating.

5.5. Volume I, Section V – Subcontracting

5.5.1 Volume I, Section V, Tab 1 – Subcontracting with local entities

The Government will evaluate this portion of the proposal based on the requirement set forth in Section 00110, and as identified in the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. The Government places a higher value on established relationships that would provide maximum subcontracting opportunities for local organizations, firms, and individuals in the disaster location.

5.5.2. Volume I Section V, Tab 2 – Proposed Subcontracting Opportunities

The Government places a higher value on a proposed subcontracting plan that exceeds the goals established in Section 00110 of this solicitation. The Government also places a higher value on plans, which are more specific in nature as to the proposed subcontracting opportunities for Small Business Community (small business (SB), small disadvantaged business (SDB), woman-owned small business (WOSB), historically black colleges and universities and minority institutions (HBCU/MI), and service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB). The Government will not award a contract without an approved subcontracting plan.

5.5.2.a Volume I Section V, Tab 2 –Subcontracting Plan

The Government will evaluate this Subcontracting Plan in accordance with AFARS Appendix DD - Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Guide - dated 01 June 1996. The Government will not award a contract without an approved subcontracting plan.

5.5.3. Volume I, Section V, Tab 3 –Subcontracting Plans Past Performance

The Government will evaluate the offeror's utilization of Small Business Community (small business (SB), small disadvantaged business (SDB), woman-owned small business (WOSB), historically black colleges and universities and minority institutions (HBCU/MI), and service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) in past contracts. The Government places a higher value on offerors that met or exceeded contract goals on previous contracts. If the Government does not receive past performance information for the project(s) identified by the offeror and cannot establish a past performance record for the offeror through other sources, the offeror will be given a neutral rating.

5.6. Volume II, Section I – Contractor Information and Certification

The cost/price portion of this evaluation will be subjectively evaluated and a best value analysis of the proposal as a whole performed to determine best value to the Government. Cost analysis will be used, where appropriate, for the purpose of determining the reasonableness, affordability, acceptability, realism, and best value of the proposals. It will assist in assuring that offerors have a clear understanding of the work requirements.

5.6.1. Volume II, Section I, Tab 1 – SF1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award

This tab will not be evaluated. The SF1442 shall be filled out completely by the offeror and signed by an official that is authorized to bind the company. The offeror shall also acknowledge all amendments to the solicitation in accordance with the instructions on the Standard Form 30 or Block 19 of SF1442.

5.6.2. Volume II, Section I, Tab 2 - Representations and Certifications (Section 00600)

This tab will not be evaluated, however the offeror shall fill out completely all representations and certifications in Section 00600 of this solicitation. This tab will be reviewed for completeness.

5.7. Volume II, Section II – Price Schedule

5.7.2. Volume II, Section II, Tab 1 – Price Schedule

The offeror shall fill out in its entirety all of Section 00010, Price Schedule. Prices must be entered for each line item. The information provided by the offeror will be subjectively evaluated based on the total for base period and all options to determine the overall best value to the Government. In order to afford maximum opportunity to local contractors, a 10% evaluation preference will be applied for evaluation purposes only. Since this is a best value source selection, this preference does not guarantee that local concerns will be successful.

6. Importance of Volumes

The evaluation process uses adjectival scoring for each volume except for Volume II containing the cost information of the proposals. The cost and pricing information found in Volume II will be subjectively evaluated. **The total value of Volume I is significantly greater than total value of Volume II. Note: all evaluation factors, other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.**

7. Proposal Revisions

At the conclusion of discussions, if required, each offeror still in the competitive range shall be given an opportunity to submit a Final Revised Proposal (See Paragraph 11.1). These proposal revisions shall be received, in writing, at a time and place established by the Contracting Officer.

8. SSEB Evaluation Report

The final SSEB evaluation report will be prepared and briefed to the Source Selection Official (SSO) and the Contracting Officer. This report will include the final consensus rating for each criterion of each offer and documented facts and findings, which support the SSEB recommendation. The report will include an assessment of each offeror's ability to accomplish the requirement. Upon completion of the Final Source Selection Evaluation Board Report, the Chairperson will ensure that SSEB members prepare

a detailed lessons-learned report prior to departing. The Chairperson of the SSEB will brief the Final SSEB Evaluation Report to the SSO.

9. Final Ranking

The successful offeror will be selected from the combined results of the evaluation process. The SSO will make the final rankings for final selection process. This ranking will be in descending order from Highest rating to Lowest rating, of all offeror's in the final competitive range if established.

10. Selection Procedure

The SSO will make the final Source Selection decision based on the information provided from the SSEB and the evaluation process and issue a Source Selection Decision Document supporting the selection. The SSA will review the comparative analysis prepared by the SSEB and briefed to him/her by the Chairperson of the SSEB, of those offerors within the competitive range, if one was determined necessary, as well as consideration of price and review of all appropriate documents. If the SSO determines that the comparative analysis does not provide enough information to make a final decision for award, documentation substantiating the decision shall be prepared by the SSO and returned with the comparative analysis to the SSEB for further action.

11. Award of Contract

11.1. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

11.2. The Government intends to award one (1) contract, not to exceed a total amount of \$100,000 for Phase I (Requirements Portion); and a not to exceed total amount of \$49,900,000 for the Option Phase II (ID/IQ Portion), if exercised, resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation criteria established in Section L, M, and the Source Selection Plan, and is considered most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The performance period of the contract shall be a basic period (from 9/15/02 – 12/01/03) with four (4) one-year option periods. Should the option for Phase II (ID/IQ Portion) be exercised, a minimum guarantee of \$98,800 will be awarded if exercised during the base period, or \$49,900 if exercised during one of the option periods.

11.3. The Government may reject any or all offers if such action is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

12. Debriefing

12.1. The debriefing of all offerors, successful or unsuccessful, will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.505 – Pre-award Debriefing of Offerors or FAR 15.506 – Post-award Debriefing Offerors. To the maximum extent practicable, debriefings should occur within five days after receipt of the written request. "Day" for the purposes of debriefing means calendar day, except that the period will run until a day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or Legal Holiday. A summary of the debriefing shall be included in the official contract file. **Offerors shall be permitted only one (1) debriefing.**

12.1.1. In accordance with FAR 15.505 – Pre-award Debriefing of Offerors - Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from the competition before award, may have a pre-award debriefing, upon written request for debriefing to the contracting officer within three days after receipt of notice of exclusion from the competition.

12.1.2. The Contracting Officer will chair debriefings with individuals that performed the evaluations providing support. At a minimum, the pre-award debriefing information shall include:

12.1.2.1. The agency's evaluation of significant elements of the offeror's proposal;

12.1.2.2. A summary of the rationale for eliminating the offeror from the competition;

12.1.2.3. Reasonable responses to relevant questions about whether source selection procedures contained in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed in the process of eliminating the offeror from the Competition.

12.1.3. The pre-award debriefings shall not disclose

12.1.3.1. The number of offerors;

12.1.3.2. The identity of other offerors;

12.1.3.3. The content of other offerors proposals;

12.1.3.4. The ranking of other offerors;

12.1.3.5. The evaluation of other offerors;

12.1.3.6. Any of the information prohibited in FAR 15.506(e).

12.2. In accordance with FAR 15.506 – Post-award Debriefing of Offerors - Offerors, upon written request received by the contracting officer within three days after receipt if notification of contract award, shall be debriefed and furnished the basis for the selection decision and contract award.

12.3. The Contracting Officer will chair debriefings with individuals that performed the evaluations providing support. At a minimum, the debriefing information shall include:

12.3.1. The Government's evaluation of the significant weaknesses or deficiencies in the offeror's proposal, if applicable;

12.3.2. The overall evaluated cost or price and technical rating, if applicable of the debriefed offeror, and past performance information on the debriefed offeror;

12.3.3. The overall ranking of all offerors when any ranking was developed by the agency during the source selection;

12.3.4. A summary of the rationale for award;

12.3.5. Reasonable responses to relevant questions about whether source selection procedures contained in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed.

12.4. The debriefings shall not:

12.4.1. Allow a point-by-point comparison of the debriefed offeror's proposal with those of other offerors

12.4.2. Reveal any information prohibited from disclosure or exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act to include:

12.4.2.1. Trade Secrets

12.4.2.2. Privileged or Confidential manufacturing processes or techniques;

12.4.2.3. Commercial and financial information that is privileged or confidential, including cost breakdowns, profit, indirect cost rates, and similar information;

12.4.2.4. The names of individuals providing reference information about an offeror's past performance.

12.5. When practicable, debriefing requests received more than three days after the offeror receives notice of contract award shall be accommodated. A Contracting Representative and the Chairperson of the SSEB will schedule the debriefing(s). Release of source selection information after award will be the responsibility of the Contracting Division in conjunction with the Office of Counsel.

Note: Due to limited space available, the contractor should limit the number of attendee's at the debriefing to four (4) or fewer.

13. 52.217-5 – Evaluation of Options (Jul 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)

(End of Section 00120)